

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-mentioned Office Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 34-43, 46-48, and 51-54 are now pending in this application. Claims 34, 39, 43, 48, and 53 are independent and have been amended herein along with dependent Claim 42. Claims 44, 45, 49, and 50 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 34-36, 39-41, 43-46, and 48-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,024,500 (Ashizaki et al.). Claims 37, 38, 42, 47, and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ashizaki et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0013894 (Parulski et al.). Claims 53 and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Parulski et al. in view of Ashizaki et al.. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 34, 39 and 53 are supported by the flowchart of Figure 46, while Claims 43 and 48 are supported by the flowchart of Figure 50. Of course, the claims are not intended to be limited in scope to these preferred embodiments.

Ashizaki et al. is directed to a printing system in which a plurality of different types of controllers are connected to one serial bus and different types of print data can be inputted to and printed by a printing unit, such as an AV/C printer. As understood Applicants, in Ashizaki et al., an AV/C printer subunit determines the type of PDL received from a desktop PC and if the PDL

is not a PDL which can be interpreted by the AV/C printer subunit, the AV/C printer subunit interprets the received PDL by referring to print data specifying information included in the captured command and converts it into a PDL which can be interpreted by the AV/C printer subunit.

However, Ashizaki et al. fails to disclose or suggest at least transmitting both a print designation created based on communication with a printing apparatus (printer), after confirming that it is possible to communicate with the printing apparatus (printer) using a predetermined protocol, and a file to the printing apparatus (printer), with the file describing a printing method of the image data and being stored or set before starting communication with the printing apparatus (printer), as is recited in independent Claims 34, 39, and 53. Nor does Ashizaki et al. disclose or suggest receiving both a print designation that includes information specifying a file, created based on communication with an image supply device, after confirming that it is possible to communicate with the image supply device using the predetermined protocol, and a file from the image supply device, with the file describing a printing method of the image data and being stored before starting communication with the printing apparatus, as is recited in independent Claims 43 and 48.

Thus, Ashizaki et al. fails to disclose or suggest important features of the present invention recited in the independent claims.

Parulski et al. describes a digital camera that can process an image for printing. As understood by Applicants, Parulski et al. describes that the digital camera can transmit a print

request file (DPOF) that can be generated even when a printer is not connected to the camera. The print request file is stored in a storage medium attached to the digital camera. However, even if Ashizaki et al. were modified with the teachings of Parulski et al., such a combination would not result in both i) a print designation created based on communication with a printing apparatus and ii) a file that was stored before starting communication with the printing apparatus being transmitted or received. Parulski et al. is not believed to remedy the deficiencies of Ashizaki et al. noted above with respect to the independent claims.

Thus, the independent claims are patentable over the citations of record. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the §§ 102 and 103 rejections are requested.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is patentably defined by independent Claims 34, 39, 43, 48, and 53. Dependent Claims 35-38, 40-42, 46, 47, 51, 52, and 54 are also allowable, in their own right, for defining features of the present invention in addition to those recited in their respective independent claims. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is requested.

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowability are requested.

Application No.: 10/529,217

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark A. Williamson/

Attorney for Applicants
Mark A. Williamson
Registration No. 33,628

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
MAWyttr

FCHS_WS 1535689v1